



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"abide" by an error of *political inexperience*, imbibed in the very cradled infancy of reform. May it not be feared that this so singular resolution has proceeded from your having viewed your object only through glasses borrowed of a jealous aristocracy, green and opaque almost to darkness, like those with which weak eyes view the sun; for how else can you, at this day of full maturity, contemplate that which was in fact a mere first, feeble, tottering step of reform in its *infancy*; and if I were not misinformed, taken in *leading strings*, as a ripe measure at this time worthy of adoption? Ought not Yorkshire now to say, "when I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things?"

Hath it never crossed your imagination, that whenever the adult mind of your country shall be called on for its opinion on the question of REPRESENTATION, around which as the sun and soul of our system, Peace, Catholic Emancipation, Religious Liberty, and a Free Press, as subordinate planets, all revolve; hath it I ask, never yet crossed your imagination, that, under all present circumstances and recollections, that same potent *Yorkshire* mind will now "take the liberty to declare its resolution" of going into the consideration of *the whole* question at once, free as the air that sweeps your mountain tops? *Limitations! Restrictions* in reasoning on self-preservation! No; that day I trust is past.

Would it, my good Sir, for preventing mutual assaults during the discussion, become "the independence and dignity" of the Freeholders of your county, to repair to the Castle-yard, like felons, in *fetters* and *hand-cuffs*? Will they, then, think you, attend with their intellects *chained* and their mouths *gagged*? Mean you to command the mental ocean, that only so far it flow, and no farther? Will you attempt to turn aside the current of the reforming wind, bearing on its wings truth and justice? Or, can you bind the sweet influences of patriot eloquence? Believe it not!

There is, it is too true, still left a rump of that body, whose feminine and feverish mind, some twenty years ago, took the phrenzy of alarm. These unhappy beings, even to this day, cannot open their lips on *English* reform, but as a *French* demon, by which they are possessed, gives them utterance. Until, by the compas-

sionate apostles of freedom, preaching salvation by the Constitution, that devil be cast out, the sufferers cannot recover the full use of their reason. The possessed seem now much troubled, that their devil can no longer be made to enter into those they esteem a swinish multitude. Among the symptoms of their malady, we find it a perpetual and a prominent idea, that it is the *nature* of petitioning to aggravate the evil petitioned against; that petitioning tends to "mischiefs, calamity, and ruin;" that its object is "UNATTAINABLE;" that consequently it leads only to a "bloody struggle," "civil war," "inevitable revolution," and the "loss of liberty." In reply, I ask only two simple questions; first, are "civil war" and "revolution" most likely to follow, from misery finding vent through the sacred and hope-inspiring practice of *petitioning*, justly accounted the brightest jewel in the tiara of the Constitution; or from the exercise of tyranny, terror, and persecution, for the express purpose of locking up in the popular bosom all its griefs and agitating passions, keeping down the spirit of reform, and stifling the voice of complaint? And, 2dly, "WHAT IS TO BECOME OF ENGLISH LIBERTY, IF WE DO NOT PETITION?"

Gracious Heaven! Have we not yet paid dearly enough for being subservient to the infernal wickedness of an apostate, who *pretended alarm*, and for the folly of his dupes? Instead of composing the mind of England, instead of rendering her *united*, impregnable, prosperous, and happy, by the reform so ardently prayed for in 1795, that vile apostate and his idiot dupes, in that disgraceful year, plunged her into a bloody war on *opinions*? I will spare you, my dear Sir, the bitter, the heart-rending and blush-raising recital of what it hath already cost us.

My next, or fourth public Letter, will be a mere copy of the private one I wrote you on the 3d of December, 1812. In my fifth, I shall again speak of the tour on which you and our friend Caley are so severe. I remain, dear Sir, very truly, your friend and servant,

JOHN CARTWRIGHT.

LETTER IV.

[N.B. The present Letter was, in fact, written and sent a year ago. Its publication at this time has been made necessary by the accusatory part of Mr. Wy-

vill's Address to the Freeholders of Yorkshire, of the 15th of October, 1813.]

MY DEAR SIR,—Much occupation must be my apology, for not having earlier replied to your expostulation, or, ought I not rather to call it your reprehension, of the 11th ult. on the contents of my printed Letter, with its Postscript, in manuscript, sent you on the 31st of October.

I had thought that, on that occasion, I was attempting a real, an unequivocal, and no unimportant service to my country. You, it seems, think the contrary.

I address that Letter to yourself and other gentlemen, that is, to "the upper classes," "persons of property," professed friends to the constitutional liberties of England; endeavouring to impress on you, and on them, the utility, the rectitude, and wisdom, of encouraging the despairing, and almost distracted people, to disburden their oppressed and agitated bosoms of the affliction and discontent with which they are labouring, in petitions for a reform of that political wrong and evil, which is the root of all their misery; and I strive to imprint on the minds of men in ease and affluence, the urgency of the case, and to excite this laudable determination, *ere the fate of our country be finally sealed.*

Sharply reprobating all this, without pointing out a single defect in the principles or the reasoning on which it rests, you call on me to "pause," to desist. For so doing, you do, indeed, favour me with your *opinion*, your bare *opinion*, which runs counter to whatever I have been accustomed to consider as sound reasoning or conclusive argument, drawn from the connection of cause and effect; and which opinion, moreover, cannot stand against facts I know to exist.

According to this *opinion*, although a large proportion of the nation shall petition for redress of the greatest wrong and direst evils, this very circumstance of their *petitioning* will, contrary to notorious experience in two recent cases, cause a *prevention* of the redress prayed for, and render it "absolutely hopeless."

What! my dear Sir, is it come to this? Are we to tremble at the thought of even *petitioning*? Are we to be ourselves revivers of delusion; authors of a new reign of terror, prostrating our understandings before hobgoblins of our own creating? And do these spectres appear in the shape of certain of "the upper classes," who, as

you say, "still enjoy" what (if I rightly construe your language,) you call a "property" in the return of Members of Parliament? Are we, from henceforth, and for ever, to bow down in mute submission to this glaring iniquity, this worst feature of our oppression, violating, in the grossest manner, not only the *property*, but the *liberty* of the whole nation?

As I must laugh at the idea of a handful of Lords, who hold corrupt power that will not bear the touch of discussion, and which must melt before public opinion like snow before the sun, coercing an *awakened* nation, showing a knowledge of their rights in the terms of their petitions; so I confess I cannot but smile at your terrors.

I have, indeed, read of men who worshipped evil spirits, creatures of their fancy; and who through mere terror fed their altars with victims and with incense; but until I shall imbibe any such credulity, I shall not be likely to fall into any such practice.

I know, my dear Sir, as well as you, that the oligarchy will not surrender their corrupt and unwarrantable power without *reluctance*. But you do not seem properly impressed with the absolute necessity of this surrender for the State's salvation; a sentiment I can only attribute to your having caught the deleterious infection of the disease called *moderate Reform*; which, next to *Taxation without Representation*, has been, perhaps, the worst of the plagues of England; although now, I trust, nearly eradicated.

Neither do you take notice of my argument, drawn from the cases of King John and King James II., for showing how such a reluctance is to be overcome. The present Duke of York, no doubt, was sufficiently *reluctant*, when, in deference to the *public voice*, he resigned his high command and lucrative office; but he *did* resign them, nor were they resumed until the storm of *public opinion* had subsided. We have also two recent cases in point, for showing the efficacy of *Petitions*; in the decisive victories obtained over Lord Sidmouth's Bill, and the Orders in Council.

The matter touching Parliamentary Reform is simply this: Should the petitioners be few in number, and a rope of sand, they will be treated with the same contempt as heretofore; but if numerous and united, as I hope and trust they will prove, they will with *perfect tranquillity* succeed: for surely, notwithstanding your extraordinary alarm, there is not in these days

any thing in the shape of a Nobleman or Gentleman, so utterly devoid of common-sense, of virtue, and of decency, as you seem to imagine, when you infer, that should three hundred thousand Englishmen but *petition* for a self-evident right, and redress of intolerable grievances, a *handful* of Lords would make war upon them.

You also entirely overlook a material consideration. While you and I, and others, have for nearly forty years, been using argument and exhortation with "the upper classes" to do their duty in respect to a reform in the people's representation, you know as well as I do, that their general language has hitherto been this: "With regard to your *object*, you are perfectly right; but you are in error respecting the *means*; the *time* is not yet arrived; the *PEOPLE* are not yet ready to support us."

Notwithstanding, my dear Sir, the constancy and the notoriety of this language, and that your own words to me now are, "*I do not doubt the success of your endeavours to obtain signatures to the new petition for reform,*" your counsel at the same time is: "Do not make known to the parties that the *time* for which they have so long waited, is arrived; that the *PEOPLE*, for whose support they called, are ready, and in array."

To me, all this, I confess, is incomprehensible. Being a man of a plain understanding, of great faith in the efficacy of *truth*, entertaining a much more charitable opinion of "the upper classes" than yourself, and being likewise much attached to open, honest, and *practicable* modes of getting onward in any work I have in hand, when I see the obvious means of overcoming obstacles hitherto insurmountable, in the simplicity of my nature I embrace and cherish those means.

If, therefore, it have pleased God, according to the usual course of His Providence, to prepare the people, by political suffering, to political reformation (closely allied, as I conceive, with *moral* reformation,) and that He hath disposed them to petition for redress, in terms, which, if successful, must completely restore public liberty, laying them forth the foundation of government in *justice*, as I humbly hope is the case, I must feel it my duty, by every exertion I can make, to aid, to cherish, and to promote such a

BELFAST MAG. NO. LXXIII.

growing disposition in my fellow-countrymen.

Not to refer to instances, without end, of the pleas for inaction, on the part of such as, at times, I have wished should stand forward, not as pupils, but as teachers; not as followers, but as leaders of the people; I will, however, avert to three of those instances.

The first is that of a noble Duke, who, in a letter to me, dated the 29th of April, 1805, says, "I hope and trust the day is not far distant, when that most desirable event, a substantial and *radical* reform in the Representation of the People may be brought to bear. In the meantime, let them see the extent of their *grievances*; let them know *whence they arise*, and let them coolly and dispassionately form *their own* judgment upon the *best and surest* remedy; it is at *hand*, simple, and of *easy attainment*."

Have we here, my dear sir, one who is to levy "war" on the people for *petitioning*?

My second instance is that of another noble Duke, of still greater borough influence, who in company at his own house, two years and a half ago, assured me that all his influence should be exerted in favour of the Reform, whenever the question should be brought forward.†

Have we here again one of those who would, if in his power, brew up "civil war," and butcher the People for *petitioning*?

My third instance is that of the *thirty*, who, according to the report of their friend, made to a select meeting at the house of Sir Francis Burdett, on Saturday, the 6th of April, 1811,‡ declined at that time to become Stewards of a public dinner of friends to parliamentary reform, as a premature measure, "*because the people were not ready to support them.*" To this dinner meeting there were, however, *two hundred and sixty five* advertised Stewards, besides others, whose names arrived too late.‡

Well, but now, my friend, when the people's *grievances* are at length daily opening their eyes, whence they are hourly

* The Duke of Bedford

† The Duke of Norfolk.

‡ Six Letters to the Marquis of Tavistock, p. 4.

§ The greater part country gentlemen.

discovering "*whence they arise*," and when you yourself have "no doubt of their readiness to petition" while it is my wish that the aforesaid noble Dukes, the *thirty*, and all the rest of those who have so long and so impatiently waited for the proper "*time*" for exertion, and for a certainty of support from the "*people*" should have a *proof* that the *time* is arrived, and a manifestation that a petitioning "*people*" are not only in readiness, but in strength, for giving them effectual support, you, my quondam fellow-labourer, are, it seems, for suppressing and smothering the whole, keeping "the upper classes" in the dark, and at the hazard of the suffering people, being driven, through neglect, to desperation and wild excess.

This, I repeat, is to me incomprehensible.

The purport of what I address to "the upper classes," the "persons of property," is this; "the *people*, for whom you have been so long waiting, being now ready, take your proper stations in the great work of saving your country; place yourselves at their head, where they wish you to appear; let them have the benefit of your knowledge, the guidance of your wisdom, the example of your prudence and virtue, so that order may keep pace with activity, tranquillity be the companion of energy, and reformation diffuse around universal joy."

You, on the contrary, in effect say,—
"No; let no gentleman endeavour to console the people by sympathizing in their sufferings, to raise their drooping hearts, to chase away despondence, to soothe their embittered spirits, to dissipate resentments, by exciting hope; to avert mischief, by suggesting a peaceful and legal mode of venting grief, not unmixed with anger. Let none of "the upper classes" the "persons of property," adopt any such "*measures*;" or even be seen among them, especially in the disturbed counties; let the discontents of the "*democracy*" rankle in their bosoms; leave the ebullition of their conflicting passions to be kept down by the bayonet and the gallows; let us have none of this union between the lower and "the higher classes;" let separation continue, and alienation increase; and let that *cause*, which has changed ENGLAND's condition from an envied prosperity to a danger which fills the land with consternation, from singular felicity to misery and despair, unresisted, unopposed, take its course!"

At this portrait of what is in effect your advice, I am sure, my friend, you will be shocked. But ask yourself if it be not just. You call on me to "*pause*," to "*reconsider*," *not* to proceed in my "*measures*," while you *do not* suggest any thing I *ought to do*; unless it be to square my conduct wholly to the good liking of those among the "*upper classes of the community*" who are interested in keeping things as they are, namely, the *borough proprietors*; for who else, among those "*classes*," are to be "*intimidated*" by *petitions*, indicating the "*nearer approach*" of a radical Parliamentary Reform, I cannot divine.

Neither can I understand why any one, not wholly absorbed in sympathy for those proprietors, to the exclusion of all other feelings and ideas, is to style such a reform "*a forcible revolution*."

When, my dear Sir, you shall have calmly reviewed what we respectively recommend, allow me to ask whose counsel, mine or your own, most directly leads to public convulsion, to "*mischief, calamity, and ruin*!" I am not afraid of the proper answer to that question.

You pointedly advert to the "*disturbed counties*." I thank you for it. It calls on me to explain why I went thither*. I had been informed that *thirty-eight* men, peaceably assembled at the sign of the Prince Regent's Arms, in Manchester, on the 11th of June, for considering on a *petition for Parliamentary Reform*, had been apprehended by a constable, taking with him a strong guard of *soldiers*, and sent to Lancaster jail, fifty miles from their business and families, there to remain three months, and then to be tried, on the accusation of a *hired informer*, for having administered an unlawful oath, the punishment of which is *transportation*.

From circumstances belonging to this case, I had the strongest suspicions that all was not well. The men were poor. A defence was likely to cost a *considerable sum*. Should they fail of a defence, their being transported for a crime partaking of the nature of *treason* seemed inevitable.

What a stab would here have been to the cause of Parliamentary Reform! How its enemies would have triumphed!

Do you wonder I was anxious that these poor men, if innocent, should not suffer

* Six months prior to the four.

the punishment, the shame, the ruin, of being banished to Botany Bay, as traitors to their country! Do you wonder at my anxiety that the cause of Parliamentary Reform should not, on this occasion, be dishonoured, through the machinations of the vilest miscreants! By an impulse not to be resisted, I was drawn down to the scene of these transactions, to watch the event. It turned out as I had from the first believed it would, *provided these poor men could have the benefit of a defence*; and I earnestly recommend it to you to read the trial; having previously paid a close attention to the *introduction*.

When you shall have read that trial, and ruminated on the *system* under which *thirty-eight men*, for meeting to petition for Parliamentary Reform, were *so treated*, and *so tried*, you will the less wonder at my being, if possible, more than ever riveted in my conviction that nothing short of truly Constitutional, that is, *radical* reform, whether it do or do not "*intimidate*" the principal authors of all our miseries, can save our country.

On the advice of Solon, the great men of Athens discharged the mortgages they held of the lands of the Commons, which were then become so great as to *threaten the ruin of the state*. In commemoration of this act of patriotism, the solemn feast of the *Seisachthes* was instituted; and why, in the present extremity of our country, shall you not as readily anticipate, on the part of the great men of England who have the pernicious boroughs, a surrender of their *usurpation*, as foretel that *petitioning* for reform will only stimulate them to rivet more closely, if possible, the nation's chains.

But, to return to the disturbed counties: what is the *cause* of the misery and mischief they have exhibited? I mean the *radical*, the *paramount* cause? Is it not that usurped and despotic power, which enables a faction, of whom the close-borough proprietors are the known *principals*, to destroy their country, its prosperity, its commerce, and even its *humblest comforts*, reducing to pauperism and the extreme of wretchedness, a large proportion of the "lower classes of the community?"

If, then, this usurpation be the true *cause* of the misery, and therefore, of the mischief also, is not petitioning for the removal of that cause, the "measure" which wisdom and integrity dictate? And where should this *petitioning* in preference

begin, if not in "the disturbed counties" where the operation of the *cause* was most conspicuous, demanding the earlier attention and counteraction? And this not merely for the general good, but in consideration more especially of the innocent part of the population, of those districts, so greatly interested in any "measure" of a conciliatory tendency, and calculated to abate desperation, by inspiring hope.

By the epithet "*new*," applied to the petition now signing, superficial readers might be led to imagine it contained novelties unknown to the English Constitution; although you are certain it does not. If it be meant that petitions on *other* principles had, before the appearance of this, been proposed and signed by other persons, neither will any such fact justify the epithet; because petitions on all the three principles of the present petition, were among the first which, more than thirty years ago, were adopted among the friends of freedom.

By the epithet, however, coupled with the displeasure that follows, all I can conjecture is, that to this petition, bottomed on three simple principles, perfectly constitutional, you give a preference to some one of those unconstitutional compounds of half-measures, which were not intended to disturb what I understand you to consider as a "property" of imposing on the people arbitrary law-makers and masters, in the place of chosen Representatives.

On this point, I have only to remark, that the puny, rickety, half-begotten notion of *moderate reform*, seems to be on its last legs. Too tender and delicate to endure the piercing rays of TRUTH, too flimsy and feeble to bear the buffetings of FREE DISCUSSION, it shrinks from the competition with *radical reform*. Unable to keep the stage, it is even now making its exit, never more, I trust, to appear in the drama of delusion. Among other evidences, my dear Sir, of great haste in the penning of your Letter, ought I not particularly to notice the terrific phantom of "civil war," which seems to have impressed on your imagination a panic terror; to which panic terror alone, I can attribute either your *opinion* or your *advice*?

On this point, I may be concise. Our *times* have no resemblance in that particular to those of Wat Tyler and Jack Straw. We are either, according to Hume, to have our euthanasia, by quietly sinking down into slavery, under corruption; and

a standing army; or, according to the *experience* of 1215 and 1688, to rise once more to freedom, by the mere omnipotence of TRUTH. To talk of a "civil war" when, on one side, the party is a government, having all property and hundreds of thousands of soldiers at command, and completely versed in the trade and science of war; and, on the other side, the party is an unarmed, starving populace, is surely to set all sober reasoning at defiance.

Were you yourself, my dear Sir, the most enthusiastic of radical reformers, or rather a champion for "a forcible revolution;" were you in enterprise a Luther; in courage a Nelson; in policy a Machiavel; you *would not have* "civil war," were it even the most earnest wish of your soul.

As to any aggravations of evil to be inflicted on us for *petitioning* for justice and freedom, allow me to say, that those already experienced ought to exclude from our bosoms the debasement of FEAR. I see not how our condition can be worse; and governing my conduct according to the best of my deliberate judgment, I feel it incumbent on me to do, what the duty I owe to God and my country prescribe, for making that condition better. When the state vessel is among rocks and quicksands in a hurricane, it is no time for giving way to fear.

As, my dear Sir, an ordinary reader, on the authority of your age and experience, combined with the tone of reproof so conspicuous in your letter, and who should not be acquainted with my abundant measure of justification, might attribute to me the folly and the criminality of *intending* that "mischief" which you consider as a result of my "measures," not only *inevitable*, but *obvious*, I have used the frankness of which you have set me the example, in conveying to you my sentiments.

I do, however, most assuredly believe, that your own intentions are perfectly patriotic; while at the same time, I hold, that, in being a *moderate* reformer you are under the influence of a *radical* error. For this conviction, I refer you to almost every page of my *Comparison*; of my *Six Letters to the Marquis of Tavistock*; of the *Appeal to the Nation*; by the *Union* for Parliamentary Reform, according to the Constitution; and to my *Printed Letter*, the receipt of which you have acknowledged;

whereas, instead of overturning the great mass of reasoning and authority in all these writings, writings which no one has yet refuted, you barely give me your unsupported *opinion* that I am wrong, and acting on "mistaken views."

It is reported, that on a recent occasion, you assured that although, as a Member of, you could not vote for him, you nevertheless wished he might be successful in his election.

As this seems to be the same as expressing a wish to see in Parliament a person of a declared and most determined hostility to Parliamentary reform, an error into which a real reformer, how *moderate* soever, could scarcely fall, I mention the report, in hopes of your contradicting it; as I take for granted you will; because, according to my recollection, the reason you gave a candidate for the University of Cambridge, a few years ago, for not voting for him was, that he declined to *declare* himself friendly to Parliamentary reform.

But when, even in your country's present extremity, I do in reality perpetually see among *moderate* reformers this sort of accommodating laxity, it rivets in my mind the deep conviction I have of the fundamental erroneousness, and incalculable mischief of *moderate* reform.

With regard to that passage in your Letter, in which you speak of "the property, and yet remaining, &c." of "the upper classes," I fear that, unless I explain, I may be thought, in what I have said, to have construed the passage in too restricted a sense. It is not my meaning, that you therein speak of a "property" in the return of Members to Parliament *exclusively*; but that such returning of Members *included*, by the word "property," in that passage.

That *some* of our borough patrons, on perceiving it to be the object of my printed letter, to promote petitioning for a *due* proportioned representation of those who *pay* the taxes, or, in other words, of the *owners* of all national property, in annual Parliaments, might even now be ready enough to yell out "Jacobinism,"—"Revolution,"—"Treason,"—if they thought any would echo their nonsense, I can well enough believe; but, I trust I can relieve you from the apprehension, that *gentlemen* in general are liable to be a second time taken in the trap of a corrupt and fraudulent alarm, by any such impudent cry.

Of about *two hundred and fifty* "persons of property," *one hundred and seventy* of them country gentlemen, to whom that printed letter was addressed, not one, yourself excepted, has, so far as I know, been disposed to entertain any dread of the consequences. Part, indeed, have not thought it necessary to return an answer, as in case of a serious fear of danger, it is to be presumed they would have done. Some few entertain slight shades of difference in opinion; and several express themselves in terms too flattering for me to repeat.

I have, however, other grounds for knowing that, among gentlemen, there is a much greater change of *opinion* on the *necessity* of radical reform than general conduct should indicate. It is in that class of the community more than in the lower classes, that a larger proportion wish for, than actually promote, such reform; and for reasons very easily imagined.

I wish it were otherwise; because when calamity from ill government have depressed the spirits of the people, and the difficulties hitherto attending the pursuit of reform, have caused too much despondence, too much fear of the hopelessness of exertion, the enlightened of "the upper classes" cannot, in my judgment, better manifest their genuine patriotism, and better provide for the public tranquillity, than by convincing the aggrieved and gloomy people, that redress is not to be had by a subversion, but by a reformation of the government; than by *encouraging* them not to despair, but to *petition*.

With sincere thanks for the good intentions of your lecture, but with an earnest wish, that you would place a firm reliance in your knowledge of the science of civil Government and the English Constitution, that is, in the true principles of REPRESENTATION, of truth and justice; despising the shallow prejudices of the proud and ignorant, as well as the insolence of the corrupt, I remain, dear Sir, with great sincerity, your friend and servant,

Dec. 5d, 1812.

J. CARTWRIGHT.

The readers of the foregoing Letter, to which I never received any other answer than what appears in the *accusatory* and *angry* passages of the Address to the Freeholders of Yorkshire, of the 15th of October, 1813, may now, perhaps, be able to resolve for themselves the two following questions, namely,

1st. In addressing the freeholders of Yorkshire, on the subject of Parliamentary reform, could it have been in any degree *necessary*, to have introduced those *accusatory* and *angry* passages at all, or any thing of the kind?

2d. Do those passages contain a just *portrait*, moral, political, or intellectual, of the writer of the foregoing Letter; or a just representation, in particular, of his *motives* for recommending in the "disturbed counties" precisely the same form of petition as he recommended in all other counties through which he passed, or any argument for showing either the impropriety or the impolicy of so acting? J. C.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE CONNECTED WITH THE RETROSPECT OF POLITICS.

To the Proprietors of the Belfast Magazine.

GENTLEMEN,

THE following reply to Crito-Philos-Crito, I sent a few days ago to the Editor of the Belfast News-Letter, requesting him to insert it in his paper, in order that his readers (who are not readers of the Magazine) might have the opportunity of hearing both sides; but he, with that illiberality and want of candour, which I am sorry to say distinguishes him, refused to give it publicity. For his reasons I have only to refer to his note

to correspondents in his paper of the 18th instant.

On his declining to publish my remarks, I sent the article to the Editor of the Chronicle, mentioning to him that it had been offered to the other newspaper for publication, and had been refused. From him I received a long letter, stating, that as the Chronicle had not made itself a party in the controversy, it would appear invidious to publish a censure on a contemporary; at the same time, acknowledging that the Belfast Magazine was a credit to Belfast; its proprietors entitled to his respect; and that if the articles sign-